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Reviewer's report:

Comments

The research is interesting, and results are quite illustrative. Also it is related to an important topic with increasing interest by the medical community. The manuscript is well written but needs improvement to be clearer to readers. The following comments are to be considered in a contributive way, in order to improve the manuscript.

Major revisions:

Page 7 line 7: Authors should reference their affirmative of increased CVD risk related to thyroid dysfunction and ckd.

Page 7 line 12: Also a reference is needed to affirm that thyroid and lipid disorder screening could slow CVD progression.

Page 8 line 27: Determination of thyroid dysfunction is unclear. All lab results should be altered, or just one to be considered as a dysfunctional gland? Further explanation is recommended.

Table 1: p value is related to which comparison? 3 and 4, 4 and 5 or 3 and 5? Also formatting is needed since the table becomes confusing.

Page 8 line 15 to 44: Results displayed in tables should not be repeated as text. Authors must choose only one way to display a result. There are several repeated results that do not add any information to the manuscript.

Page 9 line 47: Again authors report in the text many results that later are displayed in table 3. Manuscript can be resumed by only displaying results in one way or another.

Page 10 line 30: Again the authors repeat results. There is no added value to the manuscript in this repetition.

Page 10 line 56: TSH rise could not be related to lowering levels of thyroid hormones? Why would it be directly related to CKD? Why not the decrease of thyroid hormones is responsible for those results? I don`t see a clear relations between the authors statements and their actual results in the paper. Maybe the relation is only expeculative.
Page 11: Again many results are repeated and restated. Authors should avoid that. In the discussion setting I would expect more debate on the results than actually repeating them.

Minor revisions:

English revision is recommended.

Page 9 line 7: The report of the results could be better demonstrated in graphs.

Table 1: Why TSH only is expressed as a median? There is need of explanation for the analysis choices.

Table 2 is also confusing. Authors should consider formatting the table.

Page 10 line 28: Is there any particular aspect of CKD in the Nepalese population? The manuscript results cannot be extrapolated to other populations? Reasons should be explained. If not, there is no importance in repeating that the study was held in a Nepalese population.

Page 10 line 53: Authors state about trends. It would be interesting to see it in curves or graphs. The information would friendlier to readers.

Page 12: Dyslipidemia is much better discussed. Thyroid results should be similarly better discussed.

Page 12 line 52: Conclusion could benefit if rewritten. Consider being strictly related to the manuscript results in the conclusion.
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